

REMARKS

This timely responds the Office Action mailed on August 4, 2004. Claims 1-32 and 56 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 21 and 24 are independent claims. The Office Action indicates that claims 21-32 have been withdrawn from further consideration.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Election/Restrictions

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Applicants' provisional election with traverse is not found persuasive and withdrew claims 21-32 from further consideration. Also, the Examiner imposed several rejections under the assumption that claim 1 has been amended to delete certain limitations that are drawn to non-elected inventions.

Since the Requirement for Restriction has been made final, Applicants is submitting a Petition from Requirement for Restriction in order to request the Director to delegate to an appropriate official the determination of whether the Requirement for Restriction mailed on December 15, 2003 is appropriate or not.

Drawing Objection

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because Fig. 9B contains unknown characters. This objection is respectfully traversed because, in this response, Fig. 9B has been amended to replace the unknown characters with --Pumping--, as shown in the attached drawing

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto are a replacement figure sheet for Figs. 9A and 9B, which include the changes, without markings, identified below.

Fig. 9B has been amended to replace the non-English characters with --Pumping--.

replacement sheet. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objection.

Claim Objection

Claim 1 stands objected to for informalities because claim 1 is drawn to a non-elected invention. This objection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is a directed to an in-line system for manufacturing systems of which essential elements are (a) a sealant-applying unit, (b) a liquid crystal depositing unit and (c) a substrate-attaching unit. An aspect of this invention is the liquid crystal depositing unit depositing liquid crystal material *before* the substrate attaching unit conjoins the substrate with another substrate.

According to the claimed invention, liquid crystal is deposited over an open surface of a substrate. Thus, it is possible “to simplify a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display, and to minimize manufacturing costs and reduce the time required for manufacturing” (Specification, page 3, lines 3-5) compared to the conventional liquid crystal injection method.

With this in mind, if claim 1 is amended to delete the “liquid crystal depositing unit for depositing liquid crystal material on the substrate where the sealant is deposited”, as asserted by the Examiner, the invention defined in claim 1 would be no longer directed to what Applicants consider as the invention. Also, claim 1 without the “liquid crystal depositing unit” would not be able “to simplify a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display, and to minimize manufacturing costs and reduce the time required for manufacturing” (Specification, page 3, lines 3-5).

For these reasons, it appears to be reasonable to assume that the Requirement for Restriction will be vacated during the Petition from Requirement for Restriction filed herewith. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,978,065 issued to Kawasumi, *et al.* (“Kawasumi”) in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 56114928 issued to Adachi (“Adachi”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

This rejection is based on the Examiner assumption that certain limitations of claim 1 would be deleted later because they are drawn to a non-elected invention,. However, as previously mentioned, it appears to be reasonable to assume that the Requirement for Restriction will be vacated by Applicants’ Petition filed herewith and no limitation would be deleted from claim 1. Since this rejection is based on an assumption that certain limitations are deleted from claim 1, this rejection would be no longer valid if no limitations are deleted from claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-20 and 56.

Claims 1-20 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kawasumi in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,680,759 issued to Ogawa (“Ogawa”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

This rejection is based on the Examiner assumption that certain limitations of claim 1 would be deleted later because they are drawn to a non-elected invention,. However, as

previously mentioned, it appears to be reasonable to assume that the Requirement for Restriction will be vacated by Applicants' Petition filed herewith and no limitation would be deleted from claim 1. Since this rejection is based on an assumption that certain limitations are deleted from claim 1, this rejection would be no longer valid if no limitations are deleted from claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-20 and 56.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 3, 2004

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/tmk

\COM439769.1